

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 27 P 12: 26

2

1

3

WILLIAM A. MUNDELL

JIM IRVIN

MARK SPITZER

CHAIRMAN

COMMISSIONER

COMMISSIONER

4 5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

LAW OFFICES MARTINEZ & CURTIS, P.C. 2712 NORTH 7TH STREET PHOENIX, AZ 85006-1090 (602) 248-0372

Arizona Corporation Commission DOCKETED

JUL 2 7 2001 DOCKETED BY

AZ CORP COMMISSION DOCUMENT CONTROL

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF) DOCKET NO. W-01656A-98-0577 SUN CITY WATER COMPANY AND SUN CITY) DOCKET NO. SW-02334A-98-0577 WEST UTILITIES COMPANY FOR APPROVAL) OF CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT WATER UTILIZATION PLAN AND FOR AN ACCOUNTING ORDER AUTHORIZING A **GROUNDWATER SAVINGS FEE AND** RECOVERY OF DEFERRED CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT EXPENSES.

) MOTION TO CONTINUE **HEARINGS AND DEADLINE** FOR FILING REBUTTAL **TESTIMONY**

The Sun City Taxpayers Association ("SCTA") hereby respectfully requests that the deadline for filing Rebuttal Testimony and dates for the Pre-Hearing Conference scheduled for August 14, 2001 and the Hearing scheduled to commence August 15, 2001 be continued for a period of not less than 45 days. The continuance is necessary and appropriate 1) to permit the Superior Court to consider and rule upon Motions to Dismiss filed by Sun City Water Company and the Recreation Centers of Sun City (the "SC Rec Centers") in the action entitled Sun City Taxpayers Association, Inc., et al v. Recreation Centers of Sun City. Inc. and Sun City Water Company, Inc. Maricopa County Superior Court Case No. CV2001-006415; 2) to permit Citizens further opportunity to produce the Operating Agreement that is required by the terms of the Exchange Agreement with the SC Rec Centers; and 3) due to intervening deadlines that will make it extremely difficult for SCTA's counsel to adequately participate in the preparation of Rebuttal Testimony and prepare for hearing.

A. THE COURT ACTION

The Superior Court only recently scheduled oral argument on the Motions for September 10, 2001 at 9:30 a.m. (A copy of the Court's Minute Entry is attached as Exhibit A.) It is anticipated that the Superior Court will render a decision shortly after oral argument is conducted.

As the Commission knows, this court action challenges the authority of the SC Rec Centers to enter into the Exchange Agreement with Sun City Water Company because the Agreement was not approved by the membership as required by the SC Rec Centers' Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws. The Exchange Agreement is fundamental and a predicate to implementing Citizens' preferred alternative. Furthermore, Decision No. 62993 required Citizens to have such an agreement in place prior to August 1, 2000. It is wasteful of the Commission and the parties' time and resources to undertake actual hearings, which would be rendered meaningless in the event the Exchange Agreement is declared null and void. SCTA's pre-filed Testimony demonstrates numerous deficiencies in the Preliminary Engineering Report ("PER") (e.g., failure to conduct complete hydraulic studies; failure to adequately consider the use of the Beardsley Canal and Joint Use Facilities; failure to consider Sun City West's lack of firm groundwater supply; and failure to consider use of Citizens' existing storage facility). SCTA seeks a continuance to further Commission and judicial economies and preserve the resources of the parties.

While SCTA has in good faith prepared for the hearings, and has presented pre-filed Testimony, SCTA's monetary and staff resources have been stretched to an unacceptable level by being required to proceed in two forums simultaneously. The Court action will be dispositive of whether the Sun City Water Company and the SC Rec Centers

It should be emphasized, the lawsuit was filed <u>two</u> months <u>before</u> a procedural schedule was set in this matter.

can proceed pursuant to the Exchange Agreement. The Exchange Agreement is an indispensable component of Citizens' preferred alternative. Even Citizens stated at open meeting that it could not and would not commence construction of this project until the lawsuit is resolved. Therefore, even if the Commission were to find the PER adequate (which is unlikely), construction will not proceed until there is a final judicial ruling in the lawsuit. Under such circumstances, the Commission, in the exercise of its sound discretion, should continue the hearings in this matter to allow the Court to act on the SCTA's lawsuit. Requiring the parties to expend additional sums in preparing for and attending Commission hearings during the pendency of the Superior Court action is unnecessary, unproductive and wasteful.

B. AN OPERATING AGREEMENT WITH SC REC CENTERS DOES NOT YET EXIST

On June 14, 2001, Citizens, in response to a request (C-1.18) for a copy of all operating agreements (Exhibit B to the Exchange Agreements), or if none are executed, the most recent draft of the operating agreements, Citizens stated:

"At this juncture, Citizens still is negotiating with the Recreation Centers of Sun City regarding an operating agreement.

Thus, 16 months after the Commission ordered that final agreements with the golf courses be in place no later than August 2000, the Operating Agreement, a fundamental aspect of the Exchange Agreement, is still not in place. A draft of the Agreement was not even produced. Any evaluation of the PER is incomplete until the PER can be examined in context of the operating characteristics of the proposed plan, which cannot be determined until the Operating Agreement is in place. Therefore, the hearing should be continued until Citizens has an executed Operating Agreement in place with the SC Rec Centers.

1 2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

2425

^^

26

C. <u>NEW DEADLINES FACED BY SCTA'S LEGAL COUNSEL</u>

Finally, SCTA's legal counsel has deadlines that overlap the Commission's proceeding that did not exist at the time the procedural schedule was set. In particular, between now and August 13, 2001, counsel must prepare motions, cross-petitions and responses relating to two petitions for Supreme Court review filed July 13, 2001. This additional and unexpected workload will make it extremely difficult to adequately prepare Rebuttal Testimony and for Hearing. Therefore, it is likewise requested that the time for filing Rebuttal Testimony be continued.²

WHEREFORE, it is respectfully requested that the time for filing Rebuttal Testimony and that the Pre-Hearing Conference and the Hearing be continued for a period not less than forty-five (45) days.

Respectfully submitted this 27th day of July, 2001.

MARTINEZ & CURTIS, P.C.

Bv:

William P. Sullivan Paul R. Michaud

Paul R. Michaud 2712 North Seventh Street

Phoenix, Arizona 85006-1090

Attorneys for Sun City Taxpayers

Association

SCTA has no objection to the time period for filing responsive testimony to be extended a period of like time.

Scott Wakefield, Esq. RUCO 2828 North Central Avenue Suite 1200 Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Barbara R. Goldberg, Esq.
Steptoe & Johnson, LLP
Two Renaissance Square
40 North Central Avenue, 24th Floor
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4453

Mr. Walter W. Meek, President Arizona Utility Investors Association 2100 North Central Avenue Suite 210 Phoenix, Arizona 85004

William G. Beyer, Esq. 5632 W. Alameda Road Glendale, Arizona 85310 Attorney for Recreation Centers of Sun City and Recreation Centers of Sun City West

Mr. Ray Jones General Manager Sun City Water Company Post Office Box 1687 Sun City, Arizona 85372

Michael M. Grant, Esq.
Todd C. Wiley, Esq.
Gallagher & Kennedy, P.A.
2575 East Camelback Road
Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225
Attorneys for Citizens Communications
Company

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA MARICOPA COUNTY

4 *** FILED *** 07/16/2001

07/13/2001

CLERK OF THE COURT FORM VOOOA

HONORABLE COLLEEN MCNALLY

K. Ballard Deputy

CV 2001-006415

FILED:	

SUN CITY TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION BRAD K KEOGH INC, et al.

RECREATION CENTERS OF SUN CITY INC, et al.

CHARLES I KELHOFFER

TODD C WILEY

ORAL ARGUMENT SET

IT IS ORDERED setting this matter for oral argument on (1) Defendant Sun City Water Company, Inc.'s motion to dismiss and (2) Defendant Recreation Centers of Sun City, Inc.'s motion to dismiss on Monday, September 10, 2001 at 9:30 a.m. in this division, Central Court Building, 201 West Jefferson, 7th Floor, Courtroom 702, Phoenix, Arizona.

The proceeding will take place in the Superior Court's new "e-courtroom". A record of the proceedings may be made by videotape in lieu of a court reporter. Should you want an unofficial copy of the proceedings, the parties or counsel may give the Court a blank, previously unused videotape at least fifteen (15) minutes before the trial and a copy will be made at no cost. A specific type of videotape must be used for this system in order to ensure the most reliable record: Maxell or Fuji Super HG 120 (VHS) (SNG T-120) or equivalent. If the proceedings last for more than one day, a new tape must be provided each day. For the convenience of the parties, the store in the courthouse cafeteria sells the appropriate videotape. The Court can also provide a digital log, if the party provides an unused CD-R.

Docket Code 094

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA MARICOPA COUNTY

*** FILED *** 07/16/2001

07/13/2001

CLERK OF THE COURT FORM V000A

HONORABLE COLLEEN MCNALLY

K. Ballard Deputy

CV 2001-006415

Should an official transcript be required, you may request that the Court prepare it. The party ordering the transcript must pay for it. With this new technology, a court reporter is likely not required and the parties are encouraged to experience the Court's video recording system before requesting a court reporter. If a court reporter is required, the Court must receive a written request at least 48 hours before the commencement of the proceeding. Failure to timely request a court reporter will be deemed consent to proceed without a court reporter.

Oral argument shall not exceed five minutes for each side.

If extended oral argument is necessary, counsel must so advise the Court no later than four court days prior to the date set for hearing so that oral argument can be rescheduled.

Any motion or stipulation for continuance must be filed with the Court no later than four court days prior to the date set for hearing. After that date, no continuances will be granted except for extraordinary circumstances.

All memoranda and affidavits regarding the motion must be filed and copies lodged with this division no later than four court days prior to the date set for hearing.

COUNSEL ARE HEREBY DIRECTED TO PROVIDE THE COURT WITH COPIES OF ALL CASES AND STATUTES CITED IN MEMORANDA AND PLEADINGS, WHICH THEY WANT THE JUDGE TO READ AND CONSIDER. CONCERNING THE MOTION(S) TO BE RULED ON, INCLUDING ARIZONA CASES AND STATUTES.

Counsel are advised that if the answering memorandum is not timely filed in accordance Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure, oral argument may be vacated and the motion will be ruled upon in accordance with Rule 7.1(b), A.R.C.P.

IF ANY ISSUES IN THE MOTION RELATE TO DISCOVERY PROBLEMS, COUNSEL SHALL CONFER TO ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE THEIR DIFFERENCES OR TO REDUCE THE AREAS OF DISPUTE. COUNSEL ARE REMINDED THAT THE COURT WILL LIKELY IMPOSE SANCTIONS AGAINST THE LOSING PARTY IN ACCORDANCE WITH RULE 37(a)(4), RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE.

Docket Code 094